



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/885,100

06/21/2001

Joo-Hyoung Lee

P56382

3922

7590
Robert E. Bushnell
Suite 300
1522 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

07/14/2008

EXAMINER

TRAN, TRANG U

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed June 17, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In re pages 2-12, applicants argue that there is no disclosure or suggestion of a control key part which specifically controls a size and a position of the highlight portion and an adjuster part for adjusting the picture in response to external signals adjusted by said control key part as recited in claim 1, that Kuo et al does not disclose or suggest the feature of first displaying the highlight portion and then adjusting the size and position of the highlight portion as recited in claim 11, and that Kuo et al does not disclose or suggest a storage means or part for storing therein selection data for displaying a highlight portion as recited in claims 1, 22, and 32. Applicants also argue that, because there is inconsistencies between the rejection of the claims as stated in the current Office action and the previous rejection of the claims as stated in the final Office action of May 20, 2004 (Paper No. 8), and in the Office action of 3 November 2004 (Paper No. 20041021), the current rejection of claims is clearly inappropriate. Applicants further argue that, if the Examiner is alleging that certain elements or functions of claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 are "inherently" disclosed in or associated with certain elements disclosed in the reference, then a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is clearly inappropriate because the elements are not expressly disclosed in the reference. Applicants additionally argue that the claimed limitations are not

disclosed in or suggested by, and do not follow logically from, the previously quoted portion (column 4, lines 30-49) of Kuo et al '040.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed in the last Office Action, The inconsistencies between the rejection of claims as stated in the current Office action and the previous rejection of the claims as stated I the final Office action of May 20, 2004 (Paper No. 8), and in the Office action of 3 November 2004 (Paper No. 20041021) do not support for whether the rejection of claims under U.S.C. §102 is appropriate. It is noted that, for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly and, any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. As discussed in the last Office Action, Kuo et al discloses in col. 4, lines 30-49 that "moreover, the presenter can select one or more areas on the image by adding the edge of the selected areas to show portions of the image. In addition, different type of the image processing can be performed in different selected areas and outside the selected areas...The aforementioned image processing can be the flicker of the image, the brightness adjustment, the contrast, and the color of the image". From the passage, it is clear that the presenter can adjust the brightness of the selected area on the image. The brightness adjustment can add the highlight signal to the video signals to thereby increase the level of the composed video signal of the highlight portion or subtract the highlight signal form the video signals to thereby decrease the level of the composed video signals of the highlight portion as recited in the claims. Also from the pass, it is clear that the displaying part comprises a control key part (the remote controller disclosed in col. 5, lines 12-25) for controlling a

size and position of the highlight portion, and that the controller comprises an adjuster part for adjusting the picture in response to external signals adjusted by the control key part as required by the claims. Thus, all the alleged limitations are either explicitly or inherently taught in Kuo et al reference.

In re pages 12-16, applicants argue that independent claim 22 is distinguishable from the prior art so as to preclude rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 based on Kuo et al, or under 35 U.S.C. §103 for alleged unpatentability over Kuo et al, either alone or in combination with any other reference because the claimed “signal composing part connected to sigh highlight signal generating part and to said signal generating means” and “image sharpness part connected between said selection means and said signal composing part” and that the examiner has not cited any portion thereof, which would motivate or suggest to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the disclosure of Kim ‘130 should be sought for the purpose of modifying Kuo et al ‘040 in accordance with the disclosure of Kim ‘130 to arrive at the present invention.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed in the last Office Action, that the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in the final Office Action of 20 may 2004 (Paper No. 8) but, after reconsideration of Kuo et al, it is found that claims can be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rather than 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and that the claimed image sharpness part connected between selection means and a signal composing part for performing the function recited in claim 22 is met by the digital image processor 300, when the presenter uses the remote controller to change the scope, position, color, brightness, and even the number of the selected area(s) as disclosed in

col. 6, lines 6-24. Thus, all the alleged limitations are either explicitly or inherently taught in Kuo et al reference.

In re pages 16-17, applicants argue that the rejection of independent claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), or even under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) because Kuo et al '040 does not make it clear as to whether or how the pixel clock input provided to the OSP signal generator 330 results in the setting up of a size and a position of a highlight portion as alleged by the Examiner and the passage of Kuo et al quoted by the Examiner does not at all disclose a clock generating part having the function recited in claim 32, as alleged by the Examiner.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed in the last Office Action, Kuo et al discloses in col. 7, lines 7-67 that "Turning to FIG. 3, the horizontal coordinates of the points P, Q, R, and S, i.e. X_p , X_q , X_r and X_s are stored in the horizontal pixel shift register 402..., the pixel clock in horizontal counter 406 is within the value stored in horizontal pixel shift register 402...When a pixel is to be displayed, the multiplexer 516 controlled by the control signal 310 output a pixel according to the setting of the control signal 310..." From the passage, it is clear that the pixel clock under controlled of the OSP signal generator 330 anticipates the claimed "a clock generating part for generating a clock signal to set up a size and a position of the highlight portion of claim 32. Thus, all the alleged limitations are either explicitly or inherently taught in Kuo et al reference.

In re pages 17-18, applicants argue that it is not clear from the cited patent as to how the shift registers 402 and 404 perform a function of adjusting a size of a clock

signal input according to a control signal from selection means as recited in dependent claim 33 and the portion of Kuo et al (column 7, lines 7-67) cited by the Examiner does not disclose or suggest that the OSP signal generator 330 receives a pixel clock and adjusts a size of the pixel clock according to a control signal from a remote controller, as alleged by the Examiner.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above with respect to claim 32, the OSP signal generator 330 receives the pixel examiner adjusts a size of the pixel clock according to a control signal from the selection means (the remote controller). Thus, all the alleged limitations are either explicitly or inherently taught in Kuo et al reference.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trang U. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7358. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 6:30 PM, Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh N. Tran can be reached on (571) 272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

July 7, 2008

/Trang U. Tran/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622